

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/696,947	AGILANDAM ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** first action

(1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Associate attorney Nish Patel.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 18 March 2005

**Time:** 11:00Am

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

See Continuation Sheet

Claims discussed:

*All pending claims 1-13 and the numerous issues with the actual claims, since applicant has improper antecedent basis, missing steps, duplicate claims, improper dependency, and multiple other formal matters, to resolve.*

Prior art documents discussed:

None

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of rejections discussed: The fact that applicant's originally filed claims, have numerous 112 problems, grammatical errors, typographical errors, and numerous issues with "lack of antecedent basis. Additionally "if ... else ..." statements are ambiguous applicant should replace the "if ... else ..." with statements of "When ... otherwise ...." because the would "if" implies that the limitation which follows may or may not be a limitation which is claimed by applicant.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's authorized associate representative Nish Patel because the claims as originally filed have numerous problems, grammatically, typographically, and issues with missing steps, improper dependency, duplicate claims, lack of antecedent basis. Applicant attempted to clarify some of the problems, but in the course of the interview the examiner noted that the problems were too numerous to resolve via a pre-liminary amendment, therefore the examiner informed applicant that the examiner would proceed with a first office action, pointing out the main problems with the claims as originally filed, but noted that applicant should review the claims thoroughly to ensure that minor informalities are also corrected. since the examiner is not required to point out every error relating to grammar and spelling.